

194-07/WLJ

FREEHILL HOGAN & MAHAR, LLP  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
LIBRA SHIPPING SERVICES LLC  
80 Pine Street  
New York, NY 10005  
(212) 425-1900  
(212) 425-1901 fax

William L. Juska (WJ 0772)  
Pamela L. Schultz (PS 0335)

**Judge Berman**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X  
LIBRA SHIPPING SERVICES LLC,

**07 CV ( 3396**  
07 CV

Plaintiff,

**SCHULTZ AFFIDAVIT**

-against -

MIDWAY OIL HOLDINGS, LTD.

Defendant.  
-----X

PAMELA L. SCHULTZ, being duly sworn, deposes and says as follows:

1. I am a member of the Bar of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, admitted to practice before this Court and I am associated with the law firm of Freehill Hogan & Mahar, LLP, attorneys for Plaintiff herein.

2. This Affidavit is submitted pursuant to Supplemental Rule B of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (see paragraphs 3-4, below) and in support of Plaintiff's application pursuant to Rule 4(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (see paragraphs 5-9, below).

3. Deponent has made an investigation and deponent believes that based upon the results of this investigation, that Defendant MIDWAY OIL HOLDINGS, LTD. is a corporation or other business entity that cannot be "found" within this District for the

purpose of an attachment under Rule B. In support of this position, deponent has conducted the following investigation:

(a) Deponent contacted the office of the New York Department of State, Division of Corporations on April 25, 2007, via the official Department of State website at <http://www.dos.state.ny.us> and conducted a search for the Defendant and the search results indicated that the Defendant is not a New York corporation, nor is it licensed, authorized or registered to do business in the State of New York as either a domestic or international corporation;

(b) Deponent consulted with Directory Assistance for New York on April 25, 2007 for area codes (212), (347), (718), (917), (646), (914), and (845) and no listing for the Defendant, was located;

(c) Deponent reviewed the Journal of Commerce (Business Directory) Transportation Telephone Tickler, 2007 Edition (Vol. 1 New York Metropolitan Area) and no listing was found for the Defendant;

(d) Deponent accessed on April 25, 2007, through Microsoft Internet Explorer and Yahoo! Search engines the yellow pages telephone directory database and found no listing in that database for any offices or agents of the Defendant within this district;

(e) Deponent is unaware of any general or managing agent(s) within this District for any of the Defendant.

4. Based upon the foregoing, your deponent submits that the Defendant cannot be "found" within this District for the purpose of an attachment pursuant to Rule B and seeks an order of attachment against such tangible and intangible property of the

Defendant as may be found within this District up to and including the amount of the claim as specified in the Verified Complaint.

5. Plaintiff also applies, pursuant to Rule 4(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, for an Order appointing myself, Gina M. Venezia, Manuel A. Molina, Robert Ridenour, Joan Sorrentino, Christina Gargano, or any other partner, associate, paralegal or other agent of Freehill Hogan & Mahar LLP, in addition to the United States Marshal, to serve the Process of Attachment and Garnishment issued pursuant to FRCP Supplemental Rule B upon the named garnishee(s) as well as any other garnishee(s) who (based upon information developed subsequent hereto) may hold assets of, for, or on behalf of the Defendant.


6. Plaintiffs are desirous of serving the Process of Attachment and Garnishment on the garnishee(s) with all deliberate speed so that it will be fully protected against the possibility of not being able to satisfy a judgment that may ultimately be entered by Plaintiffs against the Defendant.

7. To the extent this application for an Order appointing a special process server with respect to this attachment and garnishment does not involve a restraint of physical property, there is no need to require that the service be effected by the Marshal as it simply involves delivery of the process to the respect of the garnishee(s).


8. Plaintiffs also request that the Court grant it leave to serve any additional garnishee(s) who may be discovered in the course of this litigation to be holding property of the Defendant, or any of them, within this District. By obtaining leave at this time to serve these other possible garnishees, it will facilitate prompt service of the Process

without the need to return to the Court for permission to amend the process simply to name other garnishees.

9. In addition, and to avoid the need to repetitively serve the garnishees/banking institutions, Plaintiffs respectfully seek leave, as embodied in the accompanying order, for any process served on a garnishee to be deemed effective and continuous throughout any given day on which process is served up through the next day, to authorize service by facsimile or email following an initial service of the process by hand, and to deem such facsimile or email service as being accomplished within this District if such service is transmitted or initiated from within the District.

  
Pamela L. Schultz

Sworn to before me this  
25 day of April, 2007

  
Notary Public

**MELISSA COLFORD**  
Commissioner of Deeds  
City of New York-No. 5-1692  
Certified: Filed in New York  
Commission Expires 4/1/08